



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/048,933	03/26/1998	DEAN A. KLEIN	MEI-97-01386	4879

22835 7590 10/24/2002

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 SECOND STREET  
SUITE 201  
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER

LO, LINUS H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/048,933

Applicant(s)

KLEIN, DEAN A.

Examiner

Linus H Lo

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/30/2002, Amendment.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dea '208 (of record) in view of So '559 (New)

Considering claim 1(Thrice Amended), Dea discloses a remote video processing system including compression/decompression accelerator. Dea discloses the following claimed subject matter, note:

- a) the claimed method for compressing video data in a computer system is met by the description at column 4, lines 36-41 and lines 17-19, and FIG. 1, where of the described compression/decompression accelerator 120 performs the compression method;
- b) the claimed step of receiving a stream of data from a current video frame in the computer system is met by description at column 6, lines 42-44 and FIG. 2;
- c) the claimed step of computing a difference frame from the current video frame and a previous video frame as the current video frame streams into the computer system is met by the description of the subtraction function of frame difference block 220 (column 6, lines 36-44, and column 5, lines 42-47, and FIG. 2);

Art Unit: 2614

- d) the claimed step of storing difference frame in a memory in the computer system is met by the description of buffer 248 at column 9, line 60 - column 10, line 3, and FIG. 2;
- e) the teaching of “wherein computing the difference frame includes computing the difference frame in **a core logic unit** within the computer system” as described by the compress/decompression accelerator 120 that includes the function frame difference block 220 (column 6, lines 36-44, and column 5, lines 42-47, and FIG. 1, 2); and
- f) the teaching of “the **core logic unit** that couples the processor to a main memory and a system bus for the computer system” as depicted on Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 37-60, where Fig. 1 depicts the compress/decompression accelerator 120 (core logic unit) is coupled to processor 112 and DRAM 114 through the data and system bus 116, 118.

However, Dea does not explicitly teach the claimed computing the difference frame in a **core logic chip**, wherein **the core logic chip is a north bridge chip** as recited. Nonetheless, Dea teaches the computing the difference frame in a compression/depression accelerator 120 (core logic unit) as discussed above in points (e) and (f).

So discloses an integrated circuit provides on a single chip for use with a first processor off-chip. So discloses that a VSP (wrapper-and-digital signal processor-core) used as a **graphic accelerator** is provided either at the **North bridge or AGP graphic/video chip** as described at column 17, lines 24-29. It is noted that So also discloses that accelerator (core

Art Unit: 2614

logic unit) is provided at the North Bridge Chip, and whereas such implementation which has the advantage of achieving MIPS (millions of instructions per second) column 4, lines 14-16 without substantially loading the PCI (peripheral component interface) bus (column 17, lines 24-32).

Therefore the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dea's teaching of video accelerator (core logic unit) with the teaching of **graphic accelerator** that is provided either at the **North bridge chip** for the stated advantage.

Considering claim 2, the claimed storing the current video frame in the memory in the computer system is met by the current frame memory 204 (column 6, lines 42-44, and FIG. 2).

Considering claim 3, the claimed wherein the current video frame is written over a previous video frame in the memory is met by the current frame memory 204 (column 6, lines 42-44, and FIG. 2.), whereas the current frame memory 204 receives video frame sequentially that the area stores the relatively previous video frame is subsequently replace by the newly received current video frame.

Considering claim 5, the claimed step of computing a difference between a block of data from the current video frame and a block of data from the previous video frame is met description at column 10 , lines 53-56 and column 5, lines 42-47, and FIG. 3A, where the

Art Unit: 2614

excerpt from column 10 described the utilizing of the block of data from the current and previous video frame.

Considering claim 6, the claimed wherein storing the difference frame in memory includes storing the differences frame in the memory in the memory using block transfer is met by the is met the description at column 10, lines 53 - column 11, lines 7 and column 5, lines 42-47, and FIG. 3A, where the excerpt from column 10 and 11 described the utilizing of the block of data from the current and previous video frame and subsequently recognized that data stored in buffer is in the form of block.

Considering claim 7, the claimed using the difference frame to produce compressed video data is met by the description of FIG. 3A and column 10, line 53 - column 11, line 7, whereof FIG. 3A depicted the frame difference block 220 provides a difference frame and subsequently after the variable length encoding block, the compressed video bitstream 338 is output.

Considering claim 10, the system of Dea and So discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed storing instruction and data for the computer system in the memory.

Dea teaches *a step of storing* data for the computer system in the memory as the description of DRAM at column 4, lines 52-63, and furthermore Dea teaches that the video processing system 100 (computer system) utilizes executable program instructions (column 4, lines 36-51).

Art Unit: 2614

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is both notoriously well-known in the art to integrate video processing systems in computer systems, and to consolidate storage for disparate processes in common memories.

Therefore it is submitted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system of Dea and So accordingly, in order to provide a computer backbone to facilitate the video processing and to make efficient use of memory storage capacity for both data and executable instructions.

Considering claim 12, the claimed wherein computing the difference frame includes computing the difference frame in circuitry outside of a central processing unit in the computer system is met by the processor 112 and the compression/decompression accelerator 120 (FIG. 2).

3. Claims 4, 9, 13-17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dea '208 (of record) and So '559(New), and further in view of Abramatic et al. '383 (of record).

Considering claim 4, the system of Dea and So discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed step of computing the difference frame includes computing an exclusive-OR between the current video frame and the previous video frame.

Nonetheless, Dea teaches that a step of computing *the difference frame* between the current video frame and the previous video frame as discuss above in claim 1.

Art Unit: 2614

Furthermore, Abramatic et al. teaches that a form of image compression consists the detecting variations (difference) between one image and the next one as described at column 2, lines 53-56. Abramatic et al. discloses the claimed step of computing an exclusive-OR between the current video frame and the previous video frame as met by the description at column 6, lines 52-58, whereof the described previous image at the input 55 and the arrival of new points at the input 57 which are respectively considered as the previous and current video frame.

Since Abramatic et al. teaches that XOR function for the difference calculation 56 which has the advantage of providing a less complicated means for the difference calculation techniques as elucidate at column 7, lines 32-35.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one have ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dea and So combination with such teachings for the stated advantage.

Considering claim 9, the system of Dea and So discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed using the video data in compressed form in a video conferencing system.

Since examiner takes Official Notices that it is notoriously well-known in the art for the usage of the compressed video data format in a teleconference system, whereof the compressed video data format transmission provides the benefit of bandwidth conservation on the communication medium.

Therefore it is submitted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system of Dea and So accordingly,



Art Unit: 2614

in order to facilitate the video teleconferencing functionality and to make efficient use of the bandwidth on the communication link.

Considering claim 13( Thrice Amended), Dea discloses a remote video processing system including compression/decompression accelerator. Dea discloses the following claimed subject matter, note:

- a) the claimed method for compressing video data in a computer system is met by the description at column 4, lines 36-41 and lines 17-19, and FIG. 1, where of the described compression/decompression accelerator 120 performs the compression method;
- b) the claimed step of receiving a stream of data from a current video frame in the computer system is met by description at column 6, lines 42-44 and FIG. 2;
- c) the claimed step of computing a difference frame from the current video frame and a previous video frame as the current video frame streams into the computer system is met by the description of the subtraction function of frame difference block 220 ( column 6, lines 36-44, and column 5, lines 42-47, and FIG. 2);
- d) the claimed step of storing difference frame in a memory in the computer system is met by the description of buffer 248 at column 9, line 60 - column 10, line 3, and FIG. 2;
- e) the claimed storing the current video frame in the memory in the computer system is met by the current frame memory 204 (column 6, lines 42-44, and FIG. 2);

Art Unit: 2614

- f) the claimed using the difference frame to produce compressed video data is met by the description of FIG. 3A and column 10, line 53 - column 11, line 7, whereof FIG. 3A depicted the frame difference block 220 provides a difference frame and subsequently after the variable length encoding block, the compressed video bitstream 338 is output; and
- g) the teaching of “wherein computing the difference frame includes computing the difference frame in a **core logic unit** within the computer system” as described by the compress/decompression accelerator 120 of Dea that includes the function frame difference block 220 (column 6, lines 36-44, and column 5, lines 42-47, and FIG.1, 2).
- h) the teaching of “the **core logic unit** that couples the processor to a main memory and a system bus for the computer system” as depicted on Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 37-60, where Fig. 1 depicts the compress/decompression accelerator 120 (core logic unit) is coupled to processor 112 and DRAM 114 through the data and system bus 116, 118.

However, Dea does not explicitly disclose, note :

- i) the claimed computing the difference frame in a **core logic chip**, wherein *the core logic chip is a north bridge chip* as recited, and
- ii) the claimed step of computing the difference frame includes computing an exclusive-OR between the current video frame and the previous video frame

Art Unit: 2614

Regarding (i), Dea teaches the computing the difference frame in a compression/depression accelerator 120 (core logic unit) as discussed above in points (g) and (h).

So discloses an integrated circuit provides on a single chip for use with a first processor off-chip. So discloses that a VSP ( wrapper-and-digital signal processor-core) used as a **graphic accelerator** that is provided either at the **north bridge or AGP graphic/video chip** as described at column 17, lines 24-29. It is noted that So discloses that accelerator (core logic unit) is provided at the North Bridge Chip, and So further discloses such implementation which has the advantage of achieving MIPS (millions of instructions per second, column 4, lines 14-16 )without substantially loading the PCI (peripheral component interface) bus (column 17, lines 24-32).

Therefore the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dea's teaching of video accelerator (core logic unit) with the teaching of **graphic accelerator** the is provided either at the **North bridge chip** for the stated advantage.

Regarding (ii), Dea teaches a step of computing *the difference frame* between the current video frame and the previous video frame as discuss above at point (c) above.

Furthermore, Abramatic et al. teaches that a form of video compression consists in detecting variations (difference) between on image and the next as described at column 2, lines 53-56. Abramatic et al. discloses the claimed step of computing an exclusive-OR between the current video frame and the previous video frame as met by the description at column 6,

Art Unit: 2614

lines 52-58, whereof the described previous image at the input 55 and the arrival of new points at the input 57 which are respectively considered as the previous and current video frame.

Since Abramatic et al. teaches that XOR function for the difference calculation 56 which has the advantage of providing a less complicated means for the difference calculation techniques as elucidate at column 7, lines 32-35.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one have ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Dea and So in combination with such teachings for the intended advantage.

Considering claim 14, the claimed wherein the current video frame is written over a previous video frame in the memory is met by the current frame memory 204 of Dea (column 6, lines 42-44, and FIG. 2.), whereas the current frame memory 204 receives video frame sequentially that the area stores the relatively previous video frame is subsequently replace by the newly received current video frame.

Considering claim 15, the claimed step of computing a difference between a block of data from the current video frame and a block of data from the previous video frame is met description of Dea at column 10, lines 53-56 and column 5, lines 42-47, and FIG. 3A, where the excerpt from column 10 described the utilizing of the block of data from the current and previous video frame.

Considering claim 16, the claimed wherein storing the difference frame in memory includes storing the differences frame in the memory in the memory using block transfer is met by the is met the description of Dea at column 10, lines 53 - column 11, lines 7 and column 5, lines 42-47, and FIG. 3A, where the excerpt from column 10 and 11 described the utilizing of the block of data from the current and previous video frame and subsequently recognized that data stored in buffer is in the form of block.

Considering claim 17, the system of Dea and So discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed limitation of using the video data in compressed form in a video teleconferencing system.

Since examiner takes Official Notices that it is notoriously well-known in the art for the usage of the compressed video data form in a teleconference system, whereof the compressed video data format transmission provides the benefit of bandwidth conservation on the communication linking medium.

Therefore it is submitted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the Dea and So system accordingly in order to facilitated the video teleconferencing and to make efficient use of the bandwidth on the communication link.

Considering claim 19, the system of Dea, So and Abramatic et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed step of storing instruction and data for the computer system in the memory.

Art Unit: 2614

Dea teaches *a step of storing* data for the computer system in the memory as the description of DRAM at column 4, lines 52-63, and furthermore Dea teaches that the video processing system 100 (computer system) utilizes executable program instructions (column 4, lines 36-51).

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is both notoriously well-known in the art to integrate video processing systems in computer systems, and to consolidate storage for disparate processes in common memories.

Therefore it is submitted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the system of Dea and So accordingly in order to provide a computer backbone to facilitate the video processing and to make efficient use of memory storage capacity for both the data and executable instructions.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dea '208 and So '559 (New) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hardiman ' 223 (of record).

Considering claim 8, the system of Dea and Potu discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed step of performing a color space conversion on the video data.

Hardiman discloses an invention relates to compression coding of a video program. Hardiman disclose the claimed performing a color space conversion on the video data is met by the subsampler and color space converter 80 ( column 3, lines 47-57, column 6, lines 55-64, and FIG. 2).

Hardiman discloses that by implementing the color space conversion on video data provides the benefit of properly converting the video information from a computer processed information into a displayable signal for image displaying (column 3, lines 47-57).

The examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Dea, and So by using the color space conversion circuit as taught by Hardiman for the stated benefit.

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dea '208 (of record), So '559 (New) and Abramatic et al. '383 (of Record) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Hardiman '223.

Considering claim 18, the system of Dea, So and Abramatic et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed step of performing a color space conversion on the video data.

Hardiman discloses an invention that relates to compression coding of a video program. Hardiman discloses the claimed performing a color space conversion on the video data is met by the subsampler and color space converter 80 (column 3, lines 47-57, column 6, lines 55-64, and FIG. 2)

Hardiman discloses that by implementing the color space conversion on video data provides the benefit of properly converting the video information from a computer processed information into a displayable signal for image displaying (column 3, lines 47-57).

Art Unit: 2614

The examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Dea, So and Abramatic et al. by using the color space conversion circuit as taught by Hardiman for the stated benefit.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

After further consideration, it is determined that the new found reference of So ' 559 in combination with Dea , and system of Dea, Abramatic et al., respectively , are applicable to the argued and claimed limitation as recited in claim 1 and 13 respectively. Thus a new ground of rejection is presented.

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**



Art Unit: 2614

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

*Copy of Papers Originally Filed*

8. The papers filed on *July 30, 2002* (certificate of mailing dated *July 23, 2002*) have not been made part of the permanent records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) for this application (37 CFR 1.52(a)) because of damage from the United States Postal Service irradiation process. The above-identified papers, however, were not so damaged as to preclude the USPTO from making a legible copy of such papers. Therefore, the Office has made a copy of these papers, substituted them for the originals in the file, and stamped that copy:

COPY OF PAPERS

ORIGINALLY FILED

---

Art Unit: 2614

If applicant wants to review the accuracy of the Office's copy of such papers, applicant may either inspect the application (37 CFR 1.14(d)) or may request a copy of the Office's records of such papers (*i.e.*, a copy of the copy made by the Office) from the Office of Public Records for the fee specified in 37 CFR 1.19(b)(4). Please do **not** call the Technology Center's Customer Service Center to inquiry about the completeness or accuracy of Office's copy of the above-identified papers, as the Technology Center's Customer Service Center will **not** be able to provide this service.

If applicant does not consider the Office's copy of such papers to be accurate, applicant must provide a copy of the above-identified papers (except for any U.S. or foreign patent documents submitted with the above-identified papers) with a statement that such copy is a complete and accurate copy of the originally submitted documents. If applicant provides such a copy of the above-identified papers and statement within **THREE MONTHS** of the mail date of this Office action, the Office will add the original mailroom date and use the copy provided by applicant as the permanent Office record of the above-identified papers in place of the copy made by the Office. Otherwise, the Office's copy will be used as the permanent Office record of the above-identified papers (*i.e.*, the Office will use the copy of the above-identified papers made by the Office for examination and all other purposes). This three-month period is not extendable.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Linus H. Lo whose telephone number is (703) 305-4039.

Art Unit: 2614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller, can be reached at (703) 305-4795.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**


Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

lhl

LL .

October 9, 2002

  
JOHN MILLER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600